

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 688 of 1994

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.M.MEHTA

- =====
1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed : NO
to see the judgements?
 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO
 3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy : NO
of the judgement?
 4. Whether this case involves a substantial question : NO
of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution
of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
 5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned : NO
Magistrate/Magistrates, Judge/Judges, Tribunal/Tribunals?

KHODABHAI CHATURBHAI THAKOR

Versus

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER GUJARAT ELECTRICITY BOARD

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 688 of 1994
MR HM PARIKH for Petitioner No. 1-3
NOTICE SERVED for Respondent No. 1
M/S MG DOSHIT & CO for Respondent No. 2
-

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.M.MEHTA

Date of decision: 16/06/2004

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. Khodabhai Chaturbhai Thakor and others, the
petitioners have filed this petition under Articles 226

and 227 of the Constitution of India, with a prayer that this Court may please to issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing the respondents i.e. Superintending Engineer, Gujarat Electricity Board - respondent No.1 and Gujarat Electricity Board - respondent No.2 to appoint the petitioners on the posts of Line Man in the first respondent's circle pursuant to the list prepared by the respondents.

2. It is a case of the petitioners that the petitioners have been appointed as apprentices under the respondent No.1 - Division somewhere in 1984. The order of appointment has been produced at Annexure "A" to the petition. The petitioners have also completed their apprenticeship with the first respondent's circle and the petitioners were relieved after the apprenticeship of three years and the apprenticeship was for Line Man training. It is a further case of the petitioners that the respondent board has prepared the list of the persons where the names of the petitioners have been excluded.

3. It may be noted that in an identical matter i.e. Special Civil Application No.13272 of 1993 which I have decided today, in view of the reasons mentioned in that matter, this petition is also rejected with no order as to costs. Rule is discharged.

(K.M. Mehta, J.)

syed/